

EV 471023969 US August 20, 2004

Infereby certify that this paper, and all documents indicated therein as being matter that the deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" Service under 37 CFR 1.10 on the date indicated above and addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, Mail Stop Issue Fee, P.O. Box 1230, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

PATENT

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

**INVENTOR** 

Zhao et al.

TITLE

TONER PROCESSES

APPLICATION NO.

: 09/514,699

**FILED** 

February 28, 2000

CONFIRMATION NO.

8912

**EXAMINER** 

Janis L. Dote

ART UNIT

1756

**ALLOWED** 

August 11, 2004

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

98621-US-NP

XERZ 2 00707

# RESPONSE TO STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE INCLUDING RESPONSE TO INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 Mail Stop Issue Fee

### Dear Sir:

The specification modifications discussed in the Interview are set forth in the Examiner's Amendment. The principal proposed amendments are also set forth in the Examiner's amendment.

Furthermore, Applicant gratefully acknowledges the indication as to the allowance of the present application.

98621-US-NP XERZ 2 00707 Page -2-

However, applicant respectfully submits the Statements of Reasons for Allowance are, in and of themselves, inappropriate. It is noted that the reasons for allowance are only warranted in instances in which "The record of the prosecution as a whole does not make clear his or her reasons for allowing a claim or claims." (37 CFR §1.104(e)(2001)). In the present case, applicant believes the record as a whole does make the reasons for allowance clear and, therefore, no statement by the Examiner is necessary or warranted. Furthermore, the applicant does not necessarily agree with each statement in the reasons for allowance.

Specifically, it has been indicated that the claims are allowed by importing interpretations into the claims in relation to the prior art that results in a potential imprecise and/or inaccurate understanding of the reasons. This places an unwarranted interpretation upon the claims. Such a characterization of the claims does not properly take into account applicant's claimed invention as reflected in the specification and the applicant's responses to the Examiner's office actions.

Therefore, while applicant believes the claims are allowable, applicant does not acquiesce that patentability resides in only the features, exactly as expressed in the claims, nor that each feature is required for patentability.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN, MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

August 20, 2004

Date

Richard M. Klein Reg. No. 33,000

1100 Superior Avenue, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579

(216) 861-5582





#### IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF : Zhao et al.

FOR : TONER PROCESSES

SERIAL NO. : 09/514,699

FILED : February 28, 2000

EXAMINER : Janis L. Dote

ART UNIT : 1756

NOTICE OF ALLOWANCE MAILED : August 11, 2004

CONFIRMATION NO. : 8912

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. : 98621-US-NP

XERZ 2 00707

### **CERTIFICATE OF EXPRESS MAILING UNDER 37 CFR 1.10**

"Express Mail" Mailing Label Number: EV 471023969 US

Date of Deposit: August 20, 2004

I hereby certify that the attached *Issue Fee Transmittal Form* and *Issue Fee* are being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" Service under 37 CFR 1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to: MAIL STOP ISSUE FEE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Lynda S. Kalemba